

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gev

APPLICATION NO.	٤	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,779		07/16/2003	Hugh West	25293	25293 1674	
28624	7590	11/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		COMPANY OPERTY DEPT., CI	HALPERN, MARK			
	P.O. BOX 9777 FEDERAL WAY, WA 98063			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
FEDERAL '				1731		

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary	10/621,779	WEST ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
The MAN INC DATE of this communication	Mark Halpern	1731					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co	v. mmunication.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Au	iaust 2004.						
	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National S	Stage				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/13/04.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:		-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/621,779

Art Unit: 1731

DETAILED ACTION

1) Acknowledgement is made of Amendment received 8/23/2004. Applicants amend claim 15, and offer new claims 16-18, for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2) Claims 1-2, 5-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pittman (6,670,035).

Claims 1-2, 8-10: Pittman discloses wood pulp fluff fibers having a particulate material, such as calcium oxide or magnesium oxide, attached to a retention aid, such

Art Unit: 1731

as polyamides, in an amount from about 0.1% to about 1% based on the weight of the polyamide. Since the weight of the polyamide is within the range of 5% to 75% of the weight of the fiber, the amount of the material is calculated to be within the claimed amount of the weight of the pulp fiber. Polyamide as a retention aid is disclosed in the present Specification, pg. 3, lines 1-5. Such other materials, as talc or calcium carbonate, may be considered as fillers (col. 4, lines 14-63). It is inherent, or in the least it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, that the particulate material of Pittman is capable of reducing hydrogen sulfide, since the particulate material of Pittman is the same material in the same amounts as disclosed in the present invention.

Claims 4-6, 11-13, 15: the wood pulp fluff fibers of Pittman disclosed above are made into sheets by wet-laid method, the sheet are of basis weight of up to 500 gsm. The sheets are dried (col. 5, lines 35-65).

Claims 7, 14: the products formed are absorbent (col. 5, lines 1-34).

Claims 16-18: polyamide is a water soluble retention aid as admitted in the present Specification, pg. 3, lines 1-5.

3) Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pittman in view of Hochwalt (US 2002/0054919). Pittman is applied as above for claim 1; Pittman fails to disclose that the particulate material is zeolite. Hochwalt discloses zeolite (Abstract) used for the purpose of reducing odors from hydrogen sulfite [0003], - [0007]. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Pittman and Hochwalt,

Art Unit: 1731

because such a combination would permit the product of Pittman to remove a wide variety of odors as disclosed by Hochwalt [0003].

Response to Amendment

Page 4

- 4) Claim 15 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in view of amended claim.
- 5) Applicant's arguments filed 8/23/2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants allege that the cited prior art, Pittman, discloses enhancement agents being dispersed within the polymer, and that material within the polymer is not capable of reducing the amount of hydrogen sulfide present in the environment surrounding the pulp fiber.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the location of the material) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Examiner maintains that the particulate material of Pittman is capable of reducing hydrogen sulfide, since the particulate material of Pittman is the same material in the same amounts as disclosed in the present invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,779

Art Unit: 1731

Conclusion

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 571-272-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Halpern
Mark Halpern